

## **REMARKS**

### **I. Status of the Application**

By the present Amendment, Applicant amends claim 21 and adds claims 29 and 30.

Claims 21-25 and 28-30 are all the claims pending in the Application, with claim 21 being in independent form. Claims 21-25 and 28 have been rejected.

The present Amendment addresses each point of objection and rejection raised by the Examiner. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

### **II. Formalities**

The Examiner has acknowledged the Preliminary Amendment filed on July 29, 2004, but has not acknowledged the Supplemental Preliminary Amendment filed on June 29, 2006. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner acknowledge the Supplemental Preliminary Amendment filed on June 29, 2006.

### **III. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103**

The Examiner has rejected claims 21-22, 24-25 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,190,473 to Cook et al. (hereinafter “Cook”) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0020945 to Lopez et al. (hereinafter “Lopez”). The Examiner has also rejected claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Cook in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,963,216 to Chiarabini et al. (hereinafter “Chiarabini”). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for *at least* the reasons set forth below.

As an initial matter, Applicant notes that the Examiner has rejected claims 21-22, 24-25 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Cook in view of Lopez.

However, the 01/24/08 Office Action does not set forth any grounds of rejection citing the Lopez reference. Therefore, the current rejections are improper for *at least* these reasons.

Moreover, claims 21-22, 24-25 and 28 are patentable over Cook alone for *at least* the following reasons. In order for the Examiner to maintain a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103, the cited references must teach or suggest all of the recitations of claims 21-22, 24-25 and 28. Applicant respectfully submits that Cook, Lopez, and any combination thereof, fails to teach or suggest all of the recitations of claims 21-22, 24-25 and 28.

Without conceding the merits of the Examiner's rejections, Applicant has amended claim 21 to recite (among other things):

...wherein if the content includes a plurality of contents laid out for the one of the pages being printed, then the control unit automatically changes a number of the contents laid out for the one of the pages being printed, displayed on the screen by the display unit, in accordance with a printing situation in such a manner that the number of the contents displayed on the screen is changed from a number of a first group of the contents laid out for the one of the pages being printed, to a number of a second group of the contents laid out for the one of the pages being printed, and

wherein, if the number of the contents laid out for the one of the pages being printed is four, then the number of the first group of the contents is two and the number of the second group of the contents is two.

The amendments to claim 21 are fully supported by *at least* page 25, lines 4-20 and FIGS. 6A and 6B of the originally filed specification. No new matter has been added.

Applicant respectfully submits that Cook fails to teach or suggest the above features. Among other requirements, claim 21 requires that the control unit automatically changes a number of the contents laid out for the one of the pages being printed in accordance with a printing situation in such a manner that the number of the contents displayed on the screen is changed from a number of a first group of the contents laid out for the one of the pages being printed, to a number of a second group of the contents laid out for the one of the pages being printed. For example, as recited in claim 21, if the number of the contents laid out for one page is four, then two of the contents are displayed and, then, the other two contents are displayed. That is, according to claim 21, both of the contents respectively displayed at the first instance (i.e., the first group of the contents) and the second instance (i.e., the second group of the contents) are included in the contents laid out for the one page. By way of further illustration, Applicant draws the Examiner's attention to page 25, lines 4-20 and FIGS. 6A and 6B of the present specification, which explains these features in detail.

However, Cook nowhere teaches or suggests the recitations of claim 21. Contrary to the requirements of claim 21, Cook merely teaches that the page view 50 is active a preview of an output page 76 shown on display 30, with the digital photographic images arranged on the output page in the manner in which they will be printed. Cook also teaches that to remove an image from the page 76, the view button 38 is pressed twice to cause the image view 48 to be active again, and the images stepped through until the desired image is displayed.

But, Cook fails to provide any teaching or suggesting regarding a control unit that automatically changes a number of the contents laid out for the one of the pages being printed in accordance with a printing situation in such a manner that the number of the contents displayed

on the screen is changed from a number of a first group of the contents laid out for the one of the pages being printed, to a number of a second group of the contents laid out for the one of the pages being printed, as recited in claim 21.

Therefore, claim 21 is patentable over the cited references for *at least* these reasons. Further, the dependent claims 22 and 24-25 are patentable over the cited references *at least* by virtue of their dependency on claim 21. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw these rejections.

#### **IV. New Claims**

Claims 29 and 30 are hereby added and are fully supported by the original specification. No new matter has been added.

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 29 and 30 are patentable over the cited references *at least* by virtue of their dependency and by virtue of the recitations set forth therein.

#### **V. Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(c)  
U.S. Application No.: 10/660,735

Attorney Docket No.: Q77502

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Andrew J. Taska /

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON DC SUGHRUE/265550

**65565**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

\_\_\_\_\_  
Andrew J. Taska  
Registration No. 54,666

Date: April 24, 2008